

REMARKS

The Office Action of July 29, 2010, was received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1-34 were pending in this application prior to the instant amendment, of which claims 3, 4, 6-26, 29, 30, 33 and 34 were previously withdrawn. By this amendment, claims 1, 27 and 31 are amended. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1, 2, 5, 27, 28, 31 and 32 remain currently pending for consideration.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 27, 28, 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner alleges that claims 27 and 31 each recite the limitation “the contact angle of the second region to the composition containing the pattern formation material”, which lacks sufficient antecedent basis.

With respect to this rejection, Applicant herein amends claims 27 and 31 to recite “a contact angle of the second region [...].” Thus, Applicant submits that independent claims 27 and 31 are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection. Applicant further requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 28 and 32, because the amendment herein of claims 27 and 31, upon which claims 28 and 32 rely, also cures their alleged deficiency under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Pat. App. Pub. No. JP 11-207959 to Sadao (“Sadao”), in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0059987 A1 to Sirringhaus et al. (“Sirringhaus”). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sadao in view of Sirringhaus, and further in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0017149 A1 to Maikner (“Maikner”). Claims 27 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sadao. Claims 28 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sadao, in view of Maikner. These rejections are traversed for the reasons advanced in detail below.

With respect to independent claims 1, 2, 27 and 31, the Examiner asserts that Sadao discloses, *inter alia*, forming a first region (corresponding to 11) and second region (corresponding to 10), and discharging a composition containing a pattern formation material

(corresponding to 12) to a region across the second region and the first region. *See, page 3 of the Office Action.*

Without conceding in detail the merits of the Examiner's rejection, Applicant herein amends independent claims 1, 2, 27 and 31 to recite the additional step of:

discharging a second composition containing a second pattern formation material over the first composition in the second region to form a second conductive layer wider than the first conductive layer[.]

This amendment is supported by, for example, paragraph [0087] of the application publication, U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2008/0315428 A1 ("the '428 publication").

Applicant notes that a similar feature was presented in new dependent claims 24, 26, 30 and 34, submitted in the Response to the Office Action dated May 27, 2010, and was withdrawn by the Examiner in this Office Action as allegedly being unreadable on the elected species. Applicant respectfully traverses the withdrawal of these claims, and notes that the above feature relates to Species I, elected in the Response to Election of Species Requirement dated October 21, 2009. For example, the feature is recited with respect to Embodiment 1 in paragraph [0087] of the '428 publication, relating to FIGS. 1A-1H. According to the Requirement for Restriction/Election dated September 21, 2009, elected Species I comprises the embodiment of FIG. 1. Thus, Applicant submits that the withdrawal by the Examiner of claims 24, 26, 30 and 34 was improper, and respectfully requests entry of the above amendments incorporating the features of those claims into independent claims 1, 2, 27 and 31.

Applicant submits that neither Sadao nor Sirringhaus, taken alone or in the combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious at least this newly added limitation of claims 1, 2, 27 and 31. For example, neither FIGS. 1c, 8 and 10, nor the English abstract cited by the Examiner, disclose discharging a second composition containing a second fluid body over the first composition in the affinity area (10) to form a second conductive layer wider than the first conductive layer. Sirringhaus, which the Examiner cites as allegedly disclosing that a conductive layer can be formed from an inkjet discharging method, fails to overcome this deficiency of Sadao.

Applicant submits, therefore, that the rejection of independent claims 1, 2, 27 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is improper, and should be withdrawn. The rejection of dependent claims 5, 28 and 32 is also believed to be improper at least because they are dependent on one of claims 1, 2, 27 or 31, of which Maikner fails to overcome at least their above-noted

deficiencies. In addition, dependent claims 5, 28 and 32 recite additional distinguishing features of the invention.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the instant application. If a conference would be helpful in expediting prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY, LLP

/Jeffrey L. Costellia, Reg.#35,483/
Jeffrey L. Costellia
Registration No. 35,483

NIXON PEABODY LLP
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202-585-8000
Fax: 202-585-8080